

**Draft Summary of the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
October 16, 2003**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group (RSWG) on October 16, 2003 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary:

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Resource Actions – Complete List
Attachment 5	Resource Actions – “Trails” List
Attachment 6	Resource Actions – “A” List
Attachment 7	Resource Actions – “B” List
Attachment 8	Resource Actions – “Settlement” List
Attachment 9	DPR Resource Actions – Medium Priority
Attachment 10	DPR Resource Actions – High Priority

### **Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the RSWG meeting. Attendees introduced themselves and their affiliations and the desired outcomes of the meeting were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

### **Action Items – September 25, 2003 Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the September 25, 2003 RSWG meeting is posted on the relicensing web site. Several actions items from that meeting were identified for action before tonight’s meeting, while others were due for the October 30, 2003 meeting. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items for tonight’s meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #R87:</b>	Prioritize resource actions included in the revised resource action matrix.
Status:	Results of the previous tallying process, the JPA priorities, and DWR input has been included in the latest version of the matrix, which was distributed to the RSWG for review. Prioritization is based on the classification of resource actions into “A” and “B” lists, which are reflected in the matrix. Tonight’s meeting will focus on input from the DWR and priorities provided by Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). See discussion below.
<b>Action Item #R88:</b>	Distribute revised PowerPoint presentation that focuses on resource actions organized by geographic area.
Status:	The PowerPoint presentation was distributed to the RSWG via e-mail. It will be revised, as needed, throughout the process.

## **Review, Discuss and Edit Draft Resource Action Lists**

The RSWG discussed the limitations on the Preliminary Draft Environmental Assessment (PDEA) team in evaluating every resource action proposed and acknowledged that it is not physically feasible to analyze over 300 resource actions. Moreover, there are certain resource actions that aren't appropriate for analysis (e.g., no project nexus) but which may be included as part of the settlement agreement. Resource actions included in a settlement agreement will ultimately be analyzed through the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission's (FERC) National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) process.

The RSWG discussed the timeline for the PDEA/Settlement process. April 2004 is the anticipated release date for the first draft of the PDEA. It will not include a description of individual alternatives for recreational facilities because the Recreational Needs Analysis will not be available in time to incorporate the needs information but it will provide a framework for the later document that will accompany the license application to FERC. The settlement negotiation process will begin in January 2004 with a target completion date of January 2005. The PDEA will be completed in January 2005 for submittal with the license application and will include a description of potential alternatives and any settlement items agreed to at that time.

The RSWG discussed proposed resource actions that lack a project proponent or have not garnered additional stakeholder support. The RSWG agreed that proposed resource actions must come with some support either through a stakeholder advocate or from DWR to remain in the process; however any proposed resource action may be brought into the settlement negotiations for consideration. The RSWG also acknowledged that some resource actions that have community support but are not supported by the licensee might not move forward in the PDEA analysis process at this time.

As directed by the RSWG, DWR continued refining the proposed resource action list using the geographic location-specific approach to remove redundancies and consolidate actions where appropriate. Revisions were made in track changes mode and copies distributed to the RSWG (Attachment 4). All trails-related resource actions were pulled out of the main list to form a trails list for further refinement (Attachment 5). The JPA, using a trails group organized by the JPA earlier and a draft trails report prepared by the JPA consultants, will lead the effort to consolidate the list of individual trails actions into a single trails plan resource action for consideration by the PDEA team. The remaining proposed resource actions contained in the list from the previous RSWG meeting were divided into three lists: the 'A' list composed of those prioritized actions that DWR agrees should be evaluated further by the PDEA team; the 'B' list composed of those actions that are either redundant to others either within the RSWG or included by another work group or include property acquisition which is not considered appropriate for PDEA team review; and the 'Settlement List' which includes those proposed resource actions that could be negotiated at the settlement table (Attachments 6, 7 and 8, respectively). Resource actions that are considered to be priority actions by the JPA were identified in bold on all of the lists.

Other stakeholders requested the opportunity to provide their perspective on the lists that have been developed similar to how the JPA provided their prioritization at the previous RSWG meeting. The Facilitator reminded the stakeholders that their prioritization of proposed resource actions at an earlier meeting guided the development of the geographic location-specific list. The JPA representative had specifically requested additional time to consult with their constituents at that meeting so the request was granted. Interested stakeholders may continue to provide their priorities, as the lists are refined prior to submittal to the Plenary Group and the PDEA team for analysis.

Pete Dangermond with the Dangermond Group, consultant to the JPA, reported that the trails group is currently documenting those items that have been agreed to by the JPA trails members

and this documentation will be available at the next RSWG meeting. The RSWG agreed to include an update on the trails resource action on the next RSWG meeting agenda. It was clarified that the trails-related items will eventually be consolidated into a single proposed resource action for evaluation by the PDEA team.

The RSWG discussed the content of the three lists. DWR explained that the Settlement List includes proposed resource actions with no direct or indirect project nexus and actions the Needs Analysis will not likely identify as needed to address a project-related effect. The list includes interagency management issues, funding issues and community economic development proposals. The stakeholders might provide input on these items during settlement negotiations.

The “B” list represents resource actions that will not be forwarded to the PDEA for environmental review at this time. Some of these items can be moved to the “A” list if the Needs Analysis demonstrates a need. It includes all land acquisition actions since future land needs for recreation are premature and inappropriate for the proposed level of analysis in the PDEA.

The RSWG discussed the A List and recognized that while any action may move between lists if warranted, the short-term goal is to provide the PDEA team with adequate information to begin their preliminary analysis as soon as possible. Maps will be available at the next RSWG meeting to provide a geographic context to the proposed resource actions. Each of the resource actions included on the A List was discussed and the RSWG provided comments and clarifications. Proposed revisions were noted and will be incorporated. The JPA suggested they would provide recommendations for movement of actions between lists at the next RSWG meeting.

The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) representative reported that DPR had undergone a similar prioritization exercise for the proposed resource actions as part of their General Plan planning process. DPR organized the proposed resource actions into high and medium priorities (see Attachments 9 and 10, respectively). DPR is in the process of preparing a General Plan for the LOSRA, which is paralleling the FERC relicensing process and they have identified 56 high-priority items and 42 medium-priority items. Bob Hare with DPR noted that camping- and boating-related resource actions are most important to DPR and access is a common theme among the items identified as priorities. DPR staff agreed to review the information presented at tonight's meeting and re-assess their priority lists.

The RSWG agreed to review all of the lists presented at the RSWG meeting in preparation for further discussion at the next RSWG meeting at the end of the month. The Facilitator reminded the RSWG that resource action information forms still need to be written for some resource actions. Resource actions on the A List that still need forms will be identified for the RSWG at their next meeting.

## **Next Steps**

The RSWG agreed on the following meeting date/time:

Date: Thursday, October 30, 2003  
Time: 5:00 to 10:00 PM  
Location: Kelly Ridge, Oroville

## **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the RSWG includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and item status.

- Action Item #R90:** Identify trails-related resource actions that have been agreed to by the JPA trails members and consolidate the actions included on the Trails List to develop a trails plan proposed resource action.  
**Responsible:** Dangermond Group / JPA  
**Due Date:** October 30, 2003
- Action Item #R91:** Confirm how the individual lists were developed and whether DWR will complete resource action information forms for actions on the A list that do not currently have completed forms.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** October 30, 2003
- Action Item #R92:** Provide maps at the next meeting to provide a geographic context to the resource actions.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** October 30, 2003
- Action Item #R93:** Incorporate revisions to the various resource action lists based on tonight's meeting.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** October 30, 2003
- Action Item #R94:** Identify resource actions that still need resource action identification forms, and distribute the list to the RSWG.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** October 30, 2003
- Action Item #R95:** Send study reports R1, R6, and R10 to Wade Hough.  
**Responsible:** DWR  
**Due Date:** October 30, 2003